



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

In an epilogue Miss Harrison applies her point of view to the international situation. She finds that the Allies are inspired by an anti-intellectual realism. Realism is characteristic of modern Russian literature, France is being profoundly moved by an explicit and logical anti-rationalism, and Britain also is experiencing a vague but deep-seated anti-intellectualist reaction. But Germany has had neither part nor lot in this movement of salvation. "Untouched, it would seem, by modern realism, she still worships abstractions: she is a belated idealist" (p. 247). The mixture of truth and error in this application is a good example of what occurs more than once in this book. In spite of Miss Harrison's realism, in spite of her contempt of theory, she is constantly being dragged away from reality by her own theories. But from the point of view of the reader of these essays, that is no doubt clear gain; for reality, I suspect, is not nearly as interesting as Miss Harrison's theories.

G. A. JOHNSTON.

University of Glasgow, Scotland.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ARISTOTELIAN SOCIETY. New Series. Vol. XVI. Containing the Papers read before the Society during the Thirty-Seventh Session, 1915-1916. London: Williams and Norgate, 1916. Pp. iv, 378. Price, 10s. 6d. net.

The papers in this volume which are of special ethical interest are two in number: "On the Relation of the Theoretic to the Practical Activity," by Miss Hilda D. Oakeley (pp. 133-155), and a symposium on "The Nature of the State in View of its External Relations," by Messrs. C. Delisle Burns, Bertrand Russell, and G. D. H. Cole (pp. 290-325). Miss Oakeley asks whether the attempt has ever been made to reach a philosophical satisfaction on the basis of practical life itself. Is the question a valid one *ab initio* or is it to be ruled out as self-contradictory, or may not the possibility of philosophically understanding practice have been hindered by the choice of the standpoint from which the subject has been in general approached? (p. 135). Mr. Burns argues that, both as to fact and as to principle, the traditional view of the nature of the state is vitiated because philosophers have failed to recognize the importance of external relations. Then he shows that the state is, among other things, an association of men with important moral relations to those

who do not belong to the association. Mr. Russell agrees very largely with Mr. Burns. "We may say, broadly speaking," says he (p. 307), "that there are three great evils in existing states: (1) Internal Injustice; (2) The fact of not being world-wide; (3) Interference with Liberty." "The state is a combination of men for common defence and attack, produced in the main by two motives: desire for security on the part of subjects, and desire for power on the part of rulers. Internal defence and attack are conducted generally according to rules laid down in advance, and constituting the Criminal Law. In spite of the fact that the Criminal Law has always been inclined to condemn many things which do not deserve to be condemned, including some of the most beneficent actions that a man can perform, the internal security which we owe to the state has on the whole been a gain to civilization. But in order to win this security men have set up a worship of the state which has led to a sacrifice of individual liberty and initiative far greater than any that the motive of security would have warranted. And in external affairs, every increase in the strength of the state has been a new disaster to mankind. For in external affairs the motive of dominion has triumphed over the motive of security by the wholly illusory argument that only the means of dominion would insure security. There is only one road to the security which armies and navies are nominally intended to secure, and that is the establishment of a world state which shall alone possess armed forces" (pp. 309-310). Mr. Cole agrees with Mr. Burns's general conclusion that the state is bound by moral considerations just as the individual is bound, and that the only difference is that a sanction has been established for the judgment of individuals' offences, whereas no sanction, save the force of the parties, exists in the case of states. Mr. Cole thus sums up (p. 325) the points which he tries to make. "In the first place, the introspective method in political theory has all the same disadvantages as in the theory of knowledge. It leads straight to political Solipsism, which is otherwise known as Imperialism. Secondly, the theory that states are ends in themselves is a false application to politics of Kantian ethical theory. Thirdly, the threefold problem of the individual, the state, and the political world, cannot be conceived simply in terms of a dual relation of greater and less. Individual citizens are not absorbed in their states, but have other loyalties no less binding than their loyalty

to their states. Fourthly, states are not different in kind from other forms of human association; and, as these other forms may be international or cosmopolitan, as well as national, they cannot be absorbed in national states, or, indeed, in any form of territorial organization. Fifthly, it is not enough to point out that there are of necessity practical limitations to state absolutism: the theory of state absolutism is wrong, and must be abandoned. Sixthly, the obligation which the state can impose on the citizen is limited both by the duties which the citizen owes to other associations and to himself, and by the democratic or undemocratic character of the state, not only generally, but in relation to the particular obligation which it seeks to impose. Lastly, it is implicit in all that has gone before that the state is not identical with the nation, and that the external relations of states cannot be identified with those of nations. States are only, at the most, partial embodiments of the national consciousness. The problem of conflicting social obligations appears no less in the external relations of states than in their purely domestic relations with individuals and associations within their borders."

P. J.

**THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF CHRISTIANITY.** By Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A., LL.B. London: C. W. Daniel, Ltd., 1916. Pp. 222. Price, 5s. net.

The author of this book, which is dedicated "To the Church of All Aspiring Souls," is, or was, a Congregationalist minister. His temper is religious, his sincerity obvious, his misinformation wide. He "humbly urges reasons against the historicity of Jesus Christ." So Whately urged reasons against the historicity of Napoleon Bonaparte. And with equal plausibility. Mr. Sadler's thesis is one which no theologian, however heterodox, takes seriously. Mr. Conybeare's "Historical Christ," whose publication by the Rationalist Press Association guarantees its freedom from conventional influences, is conclusive on this point.

This element of paradox neutralizes the saner elements of Mr. Sadler's thinking: to use a colloquialism, he rubs his hearers up the wrong way. His views on the ethical issues underlying contemporary politics are strong, and strongly expressed. So strongly, indeed, that, had he been a philosopher rather than a divine, he would have had reason to fear the Defence of the Realm Act: philosophers have suffered under it for less. But preachers